INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 4. JUNE, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from April 24th to May 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

April 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "IMPERIAL" INSTITUTE.

East India (Contributions by India to the Imperial Institute).—Return (presented 23rd April) to be printed. (No. 151.)

KYTHAL STATE.

East India (Kythal).—Return (presented 11th February) to be printed. (No. 148.)

April 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COOLIES IN ASSAM.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information regarding the death rate of coolies employed in the coal mines of Assam:

Whether he was aware that the Calcutta press represent that rate to be very high, and also that a very large percentage were always on the sick list:

Whether the Indian Government had any information to show that this was caused by a forced change of diet to rice:

And whether the Government could make regulations enforcing the supply to immigrants of the same kind of food they had been previously accustomed to, in the same way as was done for native soldiers in the Indian Army.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The industry to which the hon. member's question refers is, comparatively speaking, a very small one, employing little more than a thousand coolies. I have no information as to the death-rate prevailing among them, but I have seen a letter on the subject from a visitor to Assam, published in the Calcutta newspapers, in which it is stated that the death-rate and sick-rate are high; but no figures are given. The suggestion that evil effects are produced by forced change to rice diet seems improbable, inasmuch as most of these coolies are drawn from rice-consuming districts. As at present advised, I see no occasion for the issue of regulations on this subject, and I may add that the writer above-mentioned bears testimony to the excellence of existing arrangements for feeding and housing the coolies and for providing them with medical care.

AFGHANISTAN AND THE KAFIRS.

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Amír of Afghanistan had any right to control the action of the Government of India in offering an asylum to fugitive Kafirs in Chitral:

Whether the Amír was prepared to allow an unmolested exodus, not only to fugitive Kafirs from the Bashgal Valley which borders on Chitral, but also to emigrant Kafirs from other parts of Kafiristan into British territory generally:

And whether the surviving Kafirs from the present Afghan campaigns, or any future campaigns, would be protected in the enjoyment of their personal liberty, their lands and other property, and the exercise of their religious and social usages, as was implied in the right hon. gentleman's recent statements.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: So long as the Amír's Kafir subjects who seek an asylum in Chitral do not violate the usual conditions attached to their reception by the British Government which is in alliance with the Amír no such right can be claimed.

The other questions asked by the hon. member concern the Amír's internal policy and the exercise of his authority in his own territories, and I am unable to state or to anticipate what policy His Highness will pursue.

WARLIKE OPERATIONS (KILLED AND WOUNDED.)

East India (Warlike Operations) (Killed and Wounded).—Return (presented 11th February) to be printed. (No. 154.)

April 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

On the motion of Sir HENRY FOWLER an Address was granted for Copy of the Indian Financial Statement for 1896-7, and of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon.

THE LEE-METFORD BULLET.

Mr. BROOKFIELD asked the Under Secretary for War whether the "stopping" power of the Lee-Metford bullet, as shown in the Chitral expedition and by recent events in South Africa, had engaged the special attention of the military authorities, and whether it had been shown that the bullet in question was capable of any improvement with the special object of "stopping" as distinguished from merely inflicting mortal wounds, and could he state what was the minimum hole required to abruptly arrest the progress of a man charging; and whether he could state the respective calibres of the revolver used in the royal navy and the Lee-Metford rifle.

Mr. BRODRICK: The respective calibres of the revolver used in the navy and the Lee-Metford rifle are ·541 and ·303. The whole question of calibres has been carefully considered, with a view to efficiency in warfare, and any steps found necessary

will be taken. With regard to the minimum hole required to abruptly arrest the progress of a man charging, that would depend very much on the part of his person which is hit by the bullet. (Loud laughter.)

Sir W. LAWSON: Is it not the object of a rifle to inflict a mortal wound?

Mr. BRODRICK: That is the object of the bullet, but it cannot always be attained.

THE MOPLAH OUTBREAK IN MALABAR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had now received the further information with reference to the Moplah outbreak in Malabar:

And whether he would direct an independent inquiry to be held into the origin of the outbreak and the circumstances under which 88 Moplahs, who had taken refuge in a temple, were put to death.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: On the 16th of March the Government of Madras telegraphed as follows:—"A small detachment of our troops were fired upon first by Moplahs. Reinforcements arriving fired a volley which was returned. The Moplahs were then invited to surrender, but replied abusively, asking the troops to fire. One of the Moplahs cut the throats of the wounded to prevent their capture alive: others were shot dead by their own side. The collector reports that another day's delay in attack would have increased the gang to 300."

The telegram further promises a despatch which I expect to receive shortly, and pending its receipt, I see no reason to pass any orders on the subject. The Government of Madras have already deputed a former collector of the district, in whom the people have confidence, as a special commissioner to investigate the outbreak.

May 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was in a position to give any further information as to the fighting operations conducted by troops from Kabul in Kafiristan:

Whether the cession of the Bashgal Valley to Afghanistan, and the presence of Afghan troops there, contravene an essential condition of the Durand Treaty:

Whether Chandak was the extreme point allowed by that treaty for Afghan influence:

Whether the cession of the Bashgal Valley was the cession of a territory at least 30 miles to the north of Chandak, containing 40,000 inhabitants and 4,600 fighting men:

And whether he could state the terms of the agreement ratified by the Amír with reference to this valley.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no further information as to the conduct of military operations in Kafiristan.

The Bashgal Valley was assigned to the Amír under the revision on the spot prescribed by Clause 4 of the Kabul agreement of 12th November, 1893. Clause 3 of that Agreement originally contemplated that the extreme point would be Chandak or Chanak, as it is sometimes called.

The Bashgal Valley is a name roughly applied to the country from the Mandul Pass to the Kunar river, which may be 60 miles in length, with a possible population of 20,000.

The Agreement referred to has been laid on the Table and circulated.

Sir C. DILKE asked whether it was not the fact that two years elapsed between the date of the agreement and the revision, and whether the valley had not been occupied by the troops of the Amír between the dates of the two instruments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not think so, but I cannot speak confidently as to that. Eighteen months elapsed between the signing of the formal Agreement and the ratification of the revision, but the local delimitation was, I think, complete before the troops of the Amír occupied the valley.

May 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

DEMARCATION OF FRONTIERS.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the demarcation of the Perso-Beluchistan and Indo-Afghan frontier had now been completed:

And whether he proposed to lay upon the Table of the House any papers relating to this subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Perso-Biluch frontier is demarcated, but I have not yet received the final report or map. The whole of the Indo-Afghan frontier is not yet demarcated under the Kabul agreement; and although for special reasons I have laid on the Table the agreement arrived at with regard to the Bashgal Valley, I cannot give any undertaking with regard to the presentation of further papers until the work of demarcating is complete.

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF KAFIRS.

Mr. JOSEPH A. PEASE asked the Secretary of State for India whether advantage would be taken by the British Government, or the Government of India, of the favourable disposition of the Amír in discountenancing, as far as he could do so, the traffic in Kafir slaves, by urging upon him, as the ally of an anti-slavery nation, to restore the recently deported Kafirs to their homes, and to devise means for eventually terminating the institution of slavery itself throughout his dominions.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The hon. member is aware that the Viceroy intends to avail himself of any favourable opportunity to exercise his influence on behalf of the Kafirs; but it is improbable that the object contemplated by the hon. member would be promoted by any interference of the Government of India in the internal administration of Kafiristan in the direction indicated in the question.

INDIAN ARMY PENSION DEFICIENCY.

The Indian Pension Deficiency was considered in Committee.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER moved: "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of an annuity of £65,000 (beyond the present amount of £150,000 authorised by the Indian Army Pension Deficiency Act, 1885) towards discharging the liability of the Consolidated Fund in respect of certain Indian Army Pensions; and to provide that the rate of interest for any money lent after the 1st day of April, 1896, under section 5 of the said Act, shall be such as the National Debt Commissioners may determine."

Mr. D. LLOYD-GEORGE asked that some explanation should be given of the motion.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said he did explain the matter in introducing the Budget, but he would be happy to give the explanation again. Up to 1884 India discharged her liability for that part of our soldiers' pensions which was earned by service in India by the payment of a capital sum calculated on the probability of the lives of the pensioners. In 1884 it was discovered that, owing to delay in the calculations, to the omission to calculate the pensions which fell due before 1870, to the calculations being based on too high a rate of interest, and to the fund not having been properly invested, the fund was practically bankrupt, and there was nothing left to bear the charges of the pensions of soldiers which it was necessary should be borne. By an Act of 1885 Parliament set up an annuity of £150,000 for sixty years on which the Commissioners of the National Debt were authorised to borrow sufficient sums to pay the pensions as they become due, but it had been found lately that the calculations on which that annuity was based were themselves defective, and that in a very short time, if the funds were allowed to go on as now, it would become bankrupt, and there would be nothing left with which to pay future pensions. It was, therefore, necessary to provide a fresh annuity of £65,000, to close in 1941. What has happened was, of course, the fault of their predecessors, and they had no option in the matter. The provision of the money was an essential part of the financial year, and he proposed a clause on the Resolution which, according to recent practice, would be included in the Budget.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

On the motion of Mr. HANBURY an Address was presented for "Copy of Minute by the Secretary of State for India stating the circumstances under which certain members of his permanent establishment have been retained in the service after they have attained the age of sixty-five."

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

East India (Financial Statement). Return presented relative thereto [Address 30th April; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table.

May 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE NEW POSTAL CONTRACT FOR INDIA.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether any acceleration of time in the conveyance of the mails was contemplated in the new postal contract for India and the far East; and, if so, what would be the minimum speed at sea of the steamers carrying the mails:

Whether his attention had been called to the slow movement and numerous stoppages of the mail trains between Brindisi and Modane:

Whether, in view of the fact that the mails could arrive as soon in England if landed at Marseilles, without the steamer calling at Brindisi, an option would be reserved to the Post Office to make Marseilles the port both for the embarkation and debarkation of the mails for the United Kingdom.

Mr. HANBURY: Although it cannot be known what tenders will be received for the new postal contract for India and the far East, it may be said that the advertisement for tenders contemplates acceleration when the present contracts expire on January 31st, 1898, seeing that no tender is invited for as low a speed as the *minimum* required by the present contract. The lowest speeds for which tenders have been asked are $13\frac{1}{2}$ knots to and from Bombay, $13\frac{3}{4}$ knots to and from Adelaide *via* Colombo, and $11\frac{1}{2}$ knots between Colombo and Shanghai; but tenders may be sent in for any speed, higher or lower. It is the fact that in Italy the special train service for these mails is performed at a lower rate and with a greater aggregate time for stops than in France. The hon. member is doubtless aware that a considerable part of the Italian railway is a single line. The European port to be used in the service of the future is not specified in the advertisement for tenders. It will be open to parties tendering to select Marseilles: and, if an offer based upon the embarkation and landing of mails at Marseilles, showed better results than an offer based on Brindisi or any other port, the Postmaster-General would be free to choose the service *via* Marseilles.

INDIAN ARMY PENSION DEFICIENCY.

The report of the Resolution of Committee on this subject was received and agreed to without discussion.

May 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DURAND AGREEMENT.
THE STORY OF THE BASHGAL VALLEY.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between the Viceroy of India and the Amír of Afghanistan which led to the cession of the Bashgal Valley to Afghanistan:

Whether the supplementary Agreement of 19th December, 1895, was drawn up in consequence of pressure by the Amír and in the midst of the Chitral campaign, and what had been the corresponding compensation made by the Amír for the cession:

Whether the boundary, settled in principle by the Durand Treaty, was similar to the demarcation made by Colonel Holditch, of the Indian Survey Department, and whether this boundary included the Bashgal Valley and the Nari villages:

Whether one of the Boundary Commissioners, who settled the later boundary of December, 1895, was the Afghan Commander-in-Chief, and whether this line of demarcation was made to include the Bashgal Valley after its invasion by the Afghan troops:

And whether the Mehtar of Chitral and the Maháráját of Kashmír had given their written consent to the cession of the Bashgal Valley before it was made.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: 1. No correspondence took place between the Viceroy and the Amír with reference to the Bashgal Valley.

2. The decision to revise the frontier, as proposed to be laid down in the Durand Treaty, was arrived at in February, 1895, before the Chítral expedition was contemplated; and, as I have already stated, that decision was based on the ground that the topographical conditions were found to be not what they had been supposed to be. There was, therefore, no question of compensation on either side.

3. Colonel Holditch was the chief survey officer of the Commission which revised the Durand frontier in the manner (April 16th) already explained.

4. The Afghan Commander-in-Chief was one of the Afghan Commissioners, but his forces did not enter the Bashgal Valley until after the signature of the Agreement which gave that district to the Amír.

5. The Government of India conducted the negotiations on behalf of the Native States interested, and no written consent to this or to any other detail of the Agreement was necessary.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

East India (India Office, Retirement at 65). Return presented relative thereto [Address 4th May; Mr. Hanbury]; to lie upon the Table.

THE JHALAWAR CASE.

On the motion of Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS, a return was granted for Copy of Correspondence relating to the deposition of the Mahárájá Rana of Jhalawar.

May 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

East India (Indian Tariff Act and the Cotton Duties)—copy presented—of Papers relating to the Indian Tariff Act, 1896, and the Cotton Duties Act, 1896 (in continuation of [C. 7602]) (by command) to lie upon the Table.

May 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

East India (India Office, Retirement at 65),—Return (presented 7th May) to be printed. (No. 171).

PROCLAMATION AND PERFORMANCE.
THE OCCUPATION OF THE MALAKAND PASS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that in the proclamation issued by Lord Elgin before the Chitral expedition, the Government of India pledged itself not to occupy permanently any territory of the Swat tribes, he would state if the strong post recently built in the Malakand Pass was situated within that territory:

And whether he would state for what period it was proposed to occupy that post.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The proclamation to which the hon. baronet refers was issued at the outbreak of hostilities, and states that the Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which their force may pass.

The proclamation has been adhered to. Negotiations for the maintenance and protection of a road to Chitral had been carried on for some time with the tribes before the outbreak of hostilities, and the Chitral expedition afforded a favourable opportunity for completing them. With the assent and approval of the tribes, arrangements were made for protecting the road which included among other things the stationing of a force at the Malakand Pass. It will be maintained there so long as it is necessary for the purpose for which it was established.

"SPECIAL TERMS" FOR MILITARY OFFICERS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether colonels of the Indian Army drawing colonel's allowances of £1,140 per annum and more, paid £60 per annum for sons at Sandhurst and at Woolwich, while the sons of retired officers of Her Majesty's Indian Civil Service were charged £150 per annum; and, if so, if Her Majesty's Government would remedy this inequality by classing members of the Indian Civil Service with military officers according to relative rank, as they were already classed in regard to eligibility for Queen's Indian cadetships for their sons.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The facts are as stated in the question. Special terms are granted to the sons of military officers, not with reference to their means, but because their military services are held to entitle them to special facilities for sending their sons to the two military colleges. I do not think that Her Majesty's Government could be expected to extend this privilege to civilians.

QUESTIONS ON THE PROVINCIAL BUDGET.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the case that, up to the present time, the members of the Bengal Legislative Council had, under No. 7 of the rules sanctioned by the Governor-General in Council, enjoyed the right of asking questions regarding the Provincial Budget:

Whether, on the 4th of April last, the Lieutenant-Governor expressed an intention of taking away that right:

Whether the Secretary of State would state upon what grounds it was proposed to take away that right, and whether it could be taken away without an alteration of the rules sanctioned by the Governor-General in Council:

Whether he was aware that in 1894 eighteen questions were asked regarding the Provincial Budget, in 1895 sixteen questions, and in 1896 ten questions: and whether it was alleged that this right of interpellation had been in any way abused:

And whether the Secretary of State would make enquiry, and direct that this much valued right, enjoyed under Section 2 of the Indian Councils Act, 1896, should be continued.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that in the last three years a number of questions relating to the Budget have been asked, before the discussion of the Budget, in the Bengal Legislative Council. As to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor I know nothing officially, but from a newspaper report I gather that in his opinion the practice is irregular and inconvenient and tends to waste time, and that what he proposes is to assimilate in this respect the practice of his Council to that of the Supreme Council. I see no reason for any special inquiry.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I desire to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice —namely, whether there is any truth in the rumour, now furnished in some detail in some of the prints of to-day, of the dispatch of Indian troops to Suakin; further, if the rumour be true, whether a motion will be submitted to this House in connection with the subject; and, further, by whom the expense will be borne. (Hear, hear.)

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Her Majesty's Government have decided to dispatch certain Indian troops to replace the Egyptian garrison at Suakin, which, with the exception of one battalion of infantry, will be moved across to the Valley of the Nile. As regards the apportionment of expense between the two Governments it is still under consideration, and I cannot at present say whether it will be necessary or not to lay a resolution on the Table of the House.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Which two Governments?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Government of India and Her Majesty's Government, and, of course, until that matter is decided, I cannot give a definite answer as to whether it will be necessary for me to move a resolution and place it on the Table of the House.

Mr. HENRY LABOUCHERE: Are we to understand that the expense of these troops is not to be borne by the Egyptian Government?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir, not at all. (Laughter.)

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: It means, then, that in regard to the expenditure the two Governments concerned are Her Majesty's Government and the Indian Government?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER was understood to assent to this.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I should like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, before any further progress is made with the Finance Bill, we shall have a statement from him as to whether or not any or what part of the charge for these troops that are brought to Suakin will be placed on the English Exchequer?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not absolutely see the necessity for such a statement, but I will consider the matter. The present position is this—that if it is decided, as I assume, having regard to previous precedents, it will be, that the ordinary expenditure of these troops shall be charged upon the Indian Government—(cries of "Oh!")—a resolution of course would, in accordance with the Act of Parliament, be brought forward on the subject. The question whether the further expense connected with the matter will be defrayed by the Egyptian Government or by a vote of this House will be a matter for consideration.

May 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET. PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate)—copy presented—of estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India for 1895-6, compared with the results of 1894-5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts),—copy presented—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India, 1894-5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts)—copy presented—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, according to precedent, a resolution to charge the revenues of India for the cost of moving Indian troops away from India was needed, even if it was intended that the whole charge should ultimately be borne otherwise than by India:

When it was intended that the necessary resolution to charge the revenues of India for the cost of sending to Suakin the regiments now detailed for duty in the Sudan should be submitted to the House:

And whether, if it was intended that any portion of the charge, ordinary or extraordinary, should ultimately fall upon the revenues of India, the consent of the Government of India had been asked.

Lord G. HAMILTON: According to precedent, no resolution is necessary for the employment of Indian troops outside India unless a charge be imposed upon Indian revenues for that purpose. In any decision arrived at as to the apportionment or incidence of expense the views of the Indian Government will be fully considered. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Is not the noble lord aware that on March 9th, 1885, a directly opposite opinion was given on behalf of the Government on the point covered by the first paragraph of the question? (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: I think that, according to precedent, no resolution has been moved unless a charge was imposed on the Indian revenue. I do not know to whom the right hon. gentleman refers or who made the speech to which he alludes.

Sir C. DILKE: The Under-Secretary of State of the day.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not know who made the speech, but I am advised that what I have stated is accurate law. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Has not the noble lord looked at the precedent of March, 1885, in which the Under-Secretary asserted the contrary of what he has now stated?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not read the speech to which the right hon. gentleman refers, but I have followed precedent, and I have accurately described those precedents. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Unless this matter is raised upon an earlier date, which is quite possible, I shall call attention to it on the motion for the adjournment over the Whitsuntide recess. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the First Lord of the Treasury when it was proposed to give the House an opportunity of deciding upon the employment of Indian troops at Suakin, in conformity with the principle laid down in 1882 by the then Secretary of State for India, that, both legally and constitutionally, there was reserved to Parliament full control over all cases of the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers of India. The right hon. gentleman added that the Secretary of State at the time to which he referred was Lord Hartington, now the Duke of Devonshire.

Mr. BALFOUR: In point of actual law there is no obligation under the statute to have the assent of Parliament unless some extra charge is thrown upon the Indian finance. But precedent is undoubtedly in favor of giving Parliament an opportunity in these cases of discussing whether India should bear the extraordinary charges. Such an opportunity, on that assumption, would, of course, be given to the House. (Cheers.)

Mr. MORLEY: May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether he has read the passage to which this question refers? The speech was made by Lord Hartington on July 30th, 1882. In that speech the right hon. gentleman will find that his noble colleague laid down the principle which I have indicated. I also wish to ask whether the right hon. gentleman is aware that the noble duke did imply that the House was to have full control over the question whether Indian troops are to be employed at all outside India without the consent of Parliament.

Mr. BALFOUR: I do not feel called upon to give any authoritative interpretation of speeches made thirteen years ago. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. MORLEY: I shall put a question on the subject on Thursday.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the military force that was to be sent from India to Suakin was to be employed only as a garrison to defend Suakin and the district around it against attacks by the Sudanese, or whether it was intended that it should take part in the invasion of the Sudan by Egypt:

And whether any agreement had been entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Italian Government in respect to military action in the Sudan of which the House was not cognizant.

Mr. CURZON: The military force that is to be sent from India will be employed for the defence of Suakin and the surrounding district according to the judgment of the Sirdar. It is not intended that the Indian troops should take part in the operations in the valley of the Nile. No agreement has been entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Italian Government in respect to military action in the Sudan. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. LOUGH asked how many troops were going to be brought from India to Suakin.

Mr. CURZON: I think that the numbers are about 60 British officers, 60 native officers, and from 2,000 to 2,500 men. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Can the right hon. gentleman give us any information as to when the opportunity for discussion will be given to the House?

Mr. BALFOUR: I will endeavour to consult the convenience of the House, but I cannot name a day.

May 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET: PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate). Paper (presented 12th May); to be printed. [No. 179.]

East India (Home Accounts). Paper (presented 12th May) to be printed. [No. 180.]

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Sir C. DILKE said that the First Lord of the Treasury was reported in all the daily papers except one to have said yesterday afternoon that precedent was undoubtedly in favour of giving Parliament, when a movement of Indian troops away from India was proposed, an opportunity of discussing whether India should bear the ordinary charges connected therewith. In one paper, however—an important one—the right hon. gentleman was represented as using the expresssion "extraordinary charges" instead of "ordinary charges." He wished to ask whether the word "extraordinary" that occurred in this report was an error.

Mr. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; I think that is so. The view of the Government—at least, my view—on the legal point is that there is no strict obligation to bring forward a Resolution in this House if India is only charged the ordinary expenses: but precedent is in favour of having a Resolution even in these circumstances, and it is not therefore proposed to break through that precedent, although the precedent is not absolutely universal.

May 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WANTED: A PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, as stated in a telegram from Rangoon published in the *Times* of 12th May, it was true that he had offered to sanction the creation of a Legislative Council for Burma; and, if so, whether he would favourably consider the grant of a Legislative Council to the Punjab, as prayed for during the last ten years.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that the question as to the establishment of Legislative Councils in Burma and in the Punjab is now under the consideration of the Government of India, and that I am expecting to receive a report from them on the subject: but I am, of course, unable in the meantime to give any opinion as to the decision which may be arrived at.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked if the Secretary of State was aware that in 1882 Sir James Lyall, as Lieutenant-Governor, approved the proposal to establish a Legislative Council in the Punjab.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON was understood to say that he was aware of Sir James Lyall's opinion, but that subsequent Lieutenant-Governors had expressed themselves in the opposite sense.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Secretary of State for India whether native East Indian soldiers were informed on their enlistment that they were liable to be sent out of India for service abroad:

And, would he state briefly the clauses in the East Indian Enlistment Act which dealt with the territory or territories in which Indian soldiers might be called upon to serve; and, if not, would he cause a copy of the East India Enlistment Act to be placed in the library, within reach of members: and, should there be no special East India Enlistment Act, then a copy of the old East India Company's regulations on this subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Under Article 1 of the Indian Articles of War a native soldier is enlisted to go "wherever he is ordered by land or sea." The liability to be sent on foreign service is carefully explained to all recruits.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India had given its consent to the revenues of India being charged with the expenses, either ordinary or extraordinary, of the troops to be sent to Suakin:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table, as was done in a similar case in 1882-3, the telegrams and correspondence with the Government of India on the subject.

He also asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of his statement of 2nd March, he could now tell the House whether India was to bear any part of the charge for the expenses of the Indian force recently sent to Mombasa.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: We are in correspondence with the Government of India, and I will follow the precedent of 1882-83 in laying the correspondence and telegrams on the Table of the House.

As regards the second question, it would be convenient if

the hon. gentleman will allow me to defer this question till to-morrow when I hope to make a statement both with regard to Suakin and Mombasa.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Who is actually paying for the ships which are chartered for the removal of the troops from Bombay?

Lord G. HAMILTON: There is an account periodically adjusted between the Indian and Imperial Governments, by which advances are made for convenience, and it is the practice to advance sums from the Indian Treasury in connexion with the transport of troops from India. These advances are not held to be charges.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Secretary of State for India what was the estimated cost per month for ordinary expenses of the Indian military force that was being despatched to Suakin.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The approximate monthly cost in India of the native troops under orders for Suakin is Rs. 90,000 or £5,000.

Mr. MORLEY: Does this include superannuation charges?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No; I think not. It is their ordinary pay and allowances.

Mr. MORLEY: I assume, after what fell from the noble lord just now, that to-morrow is the day to be devoted to the discussion of this subject?

Mr. BALFOUR: All that my noble friend said was that to-morrow he would make a statement, both with regard to the Indian troops to be sent to Suakin and those sent to Mombasa. I propose to give the first Parliamentary day after the conclusion of the Committee stage of the Bill now under discussion to the debate of the question. (Opposition cries of "Oh, oh," and Ministerial cheers.)

May 15*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA COUNCIL'S DRAFTS.

Mr. ORR-EWING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any intention of appointing a departmental committee, as suggested by the late Secretary of State for India in September, 1895, to enquire into the present method of selling Council drafts.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no present intention of appointing a Committee but the subject shall have my careful attention.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR MOMBASA AND THE SUDAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of his statement of 2nd March, he could now tell the House whether India was to bear any part of the charge for the expenses of the Indian force recently sent to Mombasa.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As regards the cost of the employment of Indian troops at Mombasa, Her Majesty's Government do not propose that any charge shall, in connexion with their services there, be made on the revenues of India, and therefore, according both to law and precedent no Resolution is necessary to authorise their employment beyond the external frontiers of India.

Her Majesty's Government propose that the ordinary pay and allowances of the Indian native troops under orders for Suakin should continue to be borne by the revenues of India, and I will therefore give notice of my intention to move a Resolution, in accordance with precedent, to give effect to that decision.

Mr. BUCHANAN: When will the motion be put upon the paper.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Very shortly.

Sir C. DILKE: Are we to understand that the ordinary pay is to be borne otherwise than by India?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No; there is no charge upon the revenues of India in connexion with the employment of that force outside India.

Sir C. DILKE: I understood that; but does that mean that the ordinary pay of the troops is to fall upon India?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes.

May 18*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN MEDAL.

Captain CHALONER asked the Secretary of State for India whether, inasmuch as the India Medal was given for the 1863 Waziri Expedition, and also for the 1895 expedition against the same tribe, when the only fight (viz.: at Wano) was previous to the expedition being sent, and out of which it arose, he would consider the question with a view to granting the India Medal to those who took part in the 1881 expedition, in which there was a fight.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I can only refer my hon. friend to the reply given by my predecessor to a somewhat similar question on the 23rd July, 1894—nor could I reopen the question by reconsidering the request to grant a medal for an expedition which took place fifteen years ago.

THE CHITRAL PROCLAMATION.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether, inasmuch as the Proclamation of the Government to the tribes on the occasion of the Chitral campaign, entered upon on the 1st April, 1895, declared that its object was the protection, in the interest of Chitral, of the Nari villages, he would state whether the Nari villages handed over to Afghanistan under paragraph 8 of the Supplementary Agreement of 9th April, 1895, were the same Nari villages as those referred to in the Proclamation.

Whether those villages were the ancestral possession of Chitral; and, if so, would he state on what grounds Chitral had been deprived of them in direct contravention of the Proclamation:

And, whether the consent of the Suzerain of Chitral, the Mahárájá of Kashmir, had been obtained to the cession.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The proclamation referred to the objects of the Chitral expedition and to those alone.

The agreement of 9th April, 1895, completed certain delimitation proceedings between the Government of India and the Amír of Afghanistan which commenced long before any expedition to Chitral was contemplated.

The Nari villages included in Afghanistan by the Agreement of April, 1895, were no doubt villages to which the Mehtar of Chitral laid claim. This claim was not proved, and the Mehtar's right to villages not then in his possession and to which neither Chitral nor its suzerain had made out a title was not confirmed.

INDIAN EXHIBITION AT LISBON.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information regarding the projected exhibition to be held at Lisbon next year to celebrate the fourth centenary of Vasco de Gama's discovery of the route to India:

And, whether the Portuguese Government had invited England to take an important part in that exhibition; if so, whether it was intended to comply with such request.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Beyond what I have seen in the newspapers I have no information regarding the projected exhibition.

No invitation for India to take part in the exhibition has reached me.

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in accordance with section 21 of the Indian Councils Act (24 and 25 Vic., c. 67,) the Governor General of India had transmitted to him authentic copies of the Cotton Duties Act, 1896, and the Act to amend the Indian Tariff Act of 1894, and whether, under that section, he would disallow those Acts on the ground that they increase the burden of taxation on the poorest class in India, while lightening the taxation on those who were comparatively well to do:

If not, whether, by Executive order, he would remit both import and excise duties upon the coarser cloths used by the poorer classes of consumers:

And, would he state whether members of the Council of the Secretary of State had recorded minutes with regard to the re-arrangement of the cotton duties; and, if so, would he place such minutes upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received copies of the Acts named in the question; and have informed the Government of India that those Acts will be left to their operation.

It is probable that the poorer classes of the population of India are the principal consumers of the cloths made in Indian mills from counts of 20 and under, which are now taxed for the first time; but, for this among other reasons, the duty has been reduced to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. *ad valorem*, and, considering the enormous number of consumers, this additional taxation, the total amount of which has been roughly estimated at eighteen lakhs, represents an infinitesimally small increase of cost to the individual purchaser; while, on the other hand the duty on yarns has been abolished, so that the whole products of handlooms are untaxed.

It has been found by experience on more than one occasion that it is not advisable to fix a standard of quality, below which goods are exempt from taxation, and, in these circumstances, I do not propose to advise the Government of India to remit the duties recently imposed by the Legislature.

Minutes regarding these two Acts were recorded by two members of Council and by myself. There will be no objection to laying these Minutes on the Table, if the hon. baronet will move for them.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: In consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the answer of the noble lord, I beg to give notice that at the earliest possible opportunity I will call attention to this arrangement as to the cotton duties, which relieves the rich at the expense of the poor.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. MORLEY asked the noble lord the Secretary of State for India if he was now in a position to state to the House the terms of the resolution as to the Indian contingents to be sent to Suakin.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said he had not the terms of the motion with him, but he thought he could lay the motion on the Table that night.

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN AND THE INDIA OFFICE.

SIR H. FOWLER AGAIN.

Immediately at the close of questions,

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a matter of definite and urgent public importance—viz., "The effect of the Indian cotton duties as recently re-arranged, which are causing grave dissatisfaction in India by increasing the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of the consumers."

The SPEAKER asked whether the hon. gentleman was supported by forty members, as required by the rules, whereupon nearly all the members of the Opposition, save those on the front bench, rose in their places.

Leave was therefore given, but

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON inquired whether the hon. member was entitled to move the adjournment, inasmuch as he had only a few minutes ago given verbal notice of his intention to bring the question forward on an early day.

The SPEAKER said that in absolute strictness the hon. member might seem to have disentitled himself to move the adjournment by giving his notice, but if the hon. member told him that in so doing he only referred to the motion he now proposed to make he would not prevent the hon. gentleman from proceeding.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN signified his assent, and then said that very grave dissatisfaction existed in India because a new and uncalled for tax had been placed upon the necessaries of the poorest classes of the Indian consumers. The House was aware that the poorer classes in India already bore more than their fair share of taxation. (Hear, hear.) The great problem was to make the well-to-do bear a little larger share of taxation, and almost the only way to do that was to tax the finer classes of cloth, which were only worn by the richer people. The import duties upon the finer cloth was approved of by public opinion n India, but it appeared to be a very inopportune time to put a new tax of 10 lakhs of rupees upon the poorer classes when the taxes which fell upon the richer classes were being reduced by 50 lakhs. The sting of the thing to the people of India was that the new tax was quite unnecessary, and, in their opinion, was only imposed in order to give satisfaction to the Lancashire people. The people in India had been advised not to use Lancashire-made goods at all. Surely, from a political point of view, such a state of feeling as the giving of such advice exhibited ought not to be allowed to exist another day. There was no need of fresh legislation, because the noble lord could, in his Executive capacity, by a stroke of the pen remove the grievance which was being felt throughout India. This motion was in no sense a party one. He made no attack upon the Government, and far less did he wish to make an attack upon the noble lord, who he was convinced had given great attention to the subject and decided it in the way that appeared to him to be the best all round. But the noble lord laboured under the great disadvantage that he had never been in India, and therefore could not appreciate the strength of the feeling which existed in that country on this question. All classes were united upon this matter, rich and poor, official and unofficial, Indian and Anglo-Indian. The noble lord should not take comfort from thinking that the agitation had ceased. He would refer to the letter given from a leading Mahárájá, which Lord Roberts read with approval in another place. That letter said that when the people of India protested openly against any measure it was a compliment to the British nation, because it showed they hoped to get justice. The Mahárájá added: "If we had no faith in England and Englishmen all agitation would have ceased, and there would have been a death-like calmness, not perhaps a very desirable thing in the political world of India." The fact was that, if open agitation in this matter ceased in India, it was not because the people had become indifferent, but rather because the grievance complained of had sunk deeply in their minds because they had become hopeless of receiving justice. It was not unfrequently the case that when outer symptoms of discontent were suppressed real danger began. He therefore begged the noble lord to look into the real merits of the case and not to be deceived by mere outward appearances. The whole point of this controversy had reference to the question of protection. When in 1895 Sir Henry James moved the adjournment of the House on the question of the cotton duties, the ground on which he did so was that Lancashire complained that the duties were protective in their nature—that on the finer counts the protection was partial, but that on the coarser counts, owing to the tariff of 1894, it was absolute. Under that tariff all cotton goods imported were made liable to an *ad valorem* duty of 5 per cent., and by way of countervailing duty the excise was placed on yarns above 20's. The argument of Lancashire was that this gave partial protection to the Indian mills as regarded the finer counts, because Lancashire paid upon the manufactured article, whereas the Indian millowners only paid upon the raw material—namely, the yarns. Lancashire further argued that absolute protection was given with regard to the coarser goods of 20's and under, because there was no excise on the yarns of those counts. The right hon. member for Wolverhampton, who was Secretary for India at that time, did not admit the plea of protection, but he said that he was willing to make further enquiries, and that, if it was shown that protection existed, he should be prepared to take measures to remove the injustice. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer concurred in that view, and therefore the only question really at issue was the point of protection, and this was confirmed by the present Secretary for India, who at the time of the last Indian Budget promised to eliminate from the duties everything savouring of the nature of protection. With the object of dealing with the question, two Bills had been brought in by the Government of India, but he complained that this legislation went far beyond the necessities of the case. It dealt with the alleged evil of protection in regard to the complaint of Lancashire, but it went far beyond that and did an injustice to the people of India. It removed the excise duty from yarns and placed it upon woven goods—upon the manufactured article. The effect of this was to remove the grievance of Lancashire with regard to the finer counts, while it imposed injustice on the Bombay millowners, because they had to pay twice over on the stores used in their mills. But the Government of India, without any necessity, went further than this

by reducing the duty on the finer counts from 5 per cent. to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and thereby needlessly sacrificed a large amount of revenue. As to the coarser counts, also, there was the object of removing all protective influence. That might be done by placing the Lancashire producer and the Bombay producer on the same level in either of two ways —by having neither import nor excise duties, or by having both import and excise duties on the coarser counts. The universal opinion in India had been in favour of having neither import nor excise duties on the coarser counts, so that no tax should be placed on such articles used by the poorer classes. But, without any sufficient reason, that wish was put aside, and an excise duty had been placed on the industries of India. This step had caused great indignation in India, and it was for this reason that he had brought the matter forward. The Government having gone, as he had said, beyond the necessities of the case, the responsibility rested upon them of showing to the House that they were justified in the course they had adopted. It had been stated that Custom-house arrangements made it impossible to carry out the wishes of the people of India in the matter; but that could hardly be the fact, for the Government of Bombay had declared that there was no insuperable difficulty in remitting the duties on the coarser counts, and in 1878 greater difficulties of a similar character were successfully overcome. In 1878 the line tried to be drawn was at 30's, near the bulk of Manchester goods, so that the matter then was much more difficult to deal with, but it was grappled with successfully. Now the line proposed was 20's, and there is much less practical difficulty. Then there was another important point. The sole declared object of the rearrangement of the duties was to get rid of protection. But the result was to create protection on a larger scale in favour of handlooms, and mills in Native States. These together consumed three-fifths of all the yarn used in India. He was a friend to handloom weavers and to Native States, but from an economic point of view he must say they should not be given an unfair advantage. His main objection, however, was that the rearrangement relieved the richer and taxed the poorer. In the matter of food the poorer classes of India were very heavily taxed. There was no heavier tax known to the world than the salt tax, for the working man in India had to pay 40d. by way of duty for every one penny of value. Therefore he had to pay very heavily for his necessaries as regarded food, and it was not now the time to put a further tax upon his necessaries, that is, upon the wretched clothes he wore. It might be said that the amount was small, but then his means were small. The average income was $1\frac{1}{2}$d. a day, and there was not much room for taxation out of that. Therefore he came back to his main contention, that, whereas the Government had taken off 50 lakhs from the taxation of the finer cloths worn by the richer, they had done very wrong in putting 10 lakhs on the coarser cloths worn by the poorer, and he appealed to the noble lord by a stroke of the pen to remove that grievance, which would have a very beneficial effect throughout India. He believed the Secretary for India somewhat questioned the statement that the coarser cloths were worn exclusively by the poorer classes. He thought it stood to reason that the coarser and cheaper fabrics would be worn by the poorer classes, and that seemed to be the view taken by all the authorities. That was the opinion of the India Office when the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton was Secretary for India, and he did not know what further information had led the noble lord to an alteration of that opinion. It was the basis of the whole complaint that the coarser cloths were worn by the poorer people. The Bombay Government, which he regarded as the highest authority in this matter, referred to the duty as a burden of taxation to be borne by the poorer classes, and that view was supported by the native gentlemen in the Viceroy's Council. He thought it was a little fantastic to say that the poor people wore the more expensive and finer cloths. His contention was that this tax upon the poor was uncalled for and that it was very injurious, both to the people it affected and in the feeling it had produced throughout India. He had no wish that this should be a party motion at all, and he appealed for support to those hon. members on the other side who were acquainted with Indian matters. He regretted that his old friend Sir George Chesney was no longer in his place to raise his voice against this tax, as he did on a former occasion, but there were other Anglo-Indian members still sitting in the House. There was his hon. friend the member for Bethnal Green, who was a direct representative of India, and the hon. member for Cardiff, and, if he had been present he would have made his appeal to the hon. baronet the member for Manchester, who was for a long time Governor of Bombay, and also his hon. friend the member for Central Hackney, who had had a long experience in India. He felt confident that those hon. members would be prepared to confirm what he said as to the strength of the feeling on this matter throughout India. Every representative association had put in its protest against what had been done. The Chambers of Commerce were at one with the Association of Millowners. It was a very remarkable thing that the Chamber of Commerce of Bombay should have taken this view so strongly, because it consisted entirely of gentlemen engaged in the import trade of cotton goods, and they pointed out that only two members of the body had any interest whatever in the Bombay mills. Public meetings had been held in different parts of India, and in every case the strongest possible protest had been sent in. He did not know what was the real feeling of the Government of India in this matter. They seemed to have changed a good deal from their original position, and he would like to ask the noble lord if he would explain how that conversion came about. He had read the Blue-book with very great care, and there was a curious hiatus between the important dispatch sent by the noble lord on the 5th of September last and the telegram from the Government of India of the 16th of January, from which it appeared that the Government of India had found salvation from the Secretary of State's point of view. He should like to know if they could be favoured with the correspondence which took place between those dates. He thought he might also safely appeal to the Lancashire members. He wished to make no attack whatever upon them for pressing their case as strongly as they could, but he would appeal to them to be satisfied with what they had got in this matter. They had received a very great concession in the remission of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the import trade, and he would appeal to them not to oppose the proposal to remit the excise and import duties on the coarser counts. They now paid the same import as excise, and they had this advantage with regard to the double payment of taxation of stores. He really did not see why they should in any way oppose the removal on the import duties on the coarser fabrics. They had, too, at present a monopoly in drills, which were not made in India at all. Therefore this concession would actually be a benefit to them so far as drills were concerned. They had also pointed out that they were anxious to manufacture more of the coarser materials. If they were successful in doing so, it would also benefit them if the duty was taken off. If the Lancashire members were agitating so strongly for the removal of these duties altogether, surely it was illogical for them to object to a portion of the duties being removed. He also wished to appeal to the sentiment that was so forcibly put by the First Lord of the Admiralty when he pointed out how very unfortunate it would be if India and Lancashire should come into collision upon this matter. He did not wish to dilate upon the question of boycotting or of any hostile measures that might be taken in India, but it was a matter, he thought, that Lancashire should consider carefully. When they remembered that Japan, China, and America were running this country very hard in the matter of finer fabrics, it would be very unfortunate if their customers in India were to take their custom to those countries instead of to the Lancashire mills. He did not think this would be any sacrifice at all; but even if it were, it would be worth making in order to remove the feeling of indignation and to draw more closely the bonds between the people of this country and of India. He would appeal to the whole House, and remind them of what the late Viceroy said upon this subject of the financial treatment of India. Speaking in another place, he said: "There was never a moment when it is more necessary to counteract the growing impression that our financial policy in India is dictated by selfish considerations." This was a matter in which the people of India were exceedingly interested, and they would watch eagerly what the decision of that House would be. He trusted that decision would be in accordance with right and justice and humanity. (Hear, hear.)

Sir JOHN LENG, in seconding the Motion, said he could not claim to have spent the greater part of his life in India like his hon. friend the member for Banffshire, but he was very much struck with the words used by the late Secretary of State (Sir H. Fowler) on a memorable occasion when

his right hon. friend said that every member in this House was a member for India, and remembering those words he took occasion to spend the greater part of last winter on a visit to that great dependency. No one could do so without being deeply impressed with sympathy for the teeming millions of the peaceful, patient, industrial classes of India, and with a desire to do whatever was possible in a Parliamentary capacity to promote their welfare. He must admit that in moving through India he was not a little struck with the strong Conservative—he might say Imperialist—sentiments of our countrymen in India among the mercantile and manufacturing classes, and even the official classes. But he found that their Conservative and Imperialistic views had been not a little shaken by the attitude taken by a number of leading politicians in this country when in Opposition, and subsequently when they acceded to power, with regard to this question of the cotton duties. Wherever he went he heard nothing but admiration expressed for the firm attitude taken by the late Secretary for India, and on the other hand he heard nothing but resentment and strong disapprobation with regard to the course taken by a number of other politicians in—what was considered in India—the placing of local and provincial before Imperial considerations. Three things, he thought, must have struck everyone who had had time to look through the Blue-book which they received on Saturday morning. Those who had read the speeches of the able Finance Minister, Sir James Westland, in introducing this measure before the Council, must have felt that with him it was forced work, at all events, that he had very scanty respect for either the statements or the method of procedure adopted by those who took a leading part in the recent Lancashire agitation. Another impression which would be produced was that not only the non-official but that some of the most distinguished official members of the Indian Council were strongly opposed to the unsettlement of what they considered had been wisely settled in the time of the late Secretary of State. In the third place, they would find that it excited not only the opposition but the strong denunciation of the mercantile classes, and the public generally throughout our great Indian Dependency. There would be found in those papers telegram after telegram, message after message, resolution after resolution, representation after representation, from leading Chambers of Commerce in India supporting the views put forward by the Chamber of Commerce in Bombay, and it should be distinctly remembered that the members of those Chambers of Commerce, more particularly in Calcutta, were not identified with, nor interested in, the Indian cotton manufacturers in Bombay or other districts of India. They based their objections on solid and incontrovertible principles, and put forward statements of fact which, he thought, to every unprejudiced mind must be irresistible. In passing, he might observe that no stronger or more powerful statement was probably ever written on an Indian subject than that put forward by the Bombay Chamber of Commerce on these duties. During his visit to India he had many opportunities of meeting with commercial gentlemen, and he found that they were very strongly impressed with the view that those changes were not dictated by considerations for the interests of the people of India, but from political considerations in the home country. He would be glad if hon. members would turn to the very able speech of the Hon. Patrick Playfair. That gentleman was not a cotton manufacturer or cotton merchant, but was a most enlightened merchant in Calcutta, and on this and on other questions put forward most statesmanlike views. His contention was that if there was a surplus to be disposed of it would be better in the interests of the Manchester and Lancashire manufacturers that that surplus should be devoted to the construction of railways and the opening up of India for the distribution of the Manchester and Lancashire goods, rather than to be frittered away in the manner in which the Home Government had selected. Not only did the Hon. Mr. Playfair speak strongly on the matter, but three of the representatives of the native free provinces—the Hon. Sahib Balwant Rao, representing the Central Provinces; the Hon. Ananda Charlu, representing the Madras Presidency; and the Hon. Mr. Stevens, all spoke equally strongly. He would not weary the House by many quotations, but he might be permitted for a minute or two to select a passage from one of these speeches, namely, the Hon. Ananda Charlu. That gentleman said: "I am deeply grieved to find—I say this far more in sorrow than in anger—that our Finance Minister and the Government of which he is the adviser have allowed themselves to be overpowered by the unreasoning outcry of Lancashire, and to be tempted and drawn out of their safe and incontrovertible stronghold. I beseech the responsible ministers who have the power, if they possess the will, to see that our interests are not ruthlessly jeopardised. To my Anglo-Indian colleagues—my non-official colleagues in particular—I have a word of earnest prayer. I know that most of their class believe in a Conservative ministry, and that they are demonstrably partial to it. I know also that many Conservative members who constitute the bulwark of that ministry have entered Parliament pledged to look after the interests of Lancashire in India. I mean no offence when I therefore say, what I cannot help feeling, that my Anglo-Indian colleagues would be in the last degree reluctant to impair the bulwark. But I shall beg of them to bear in mind that while India is safeguarded against foreign inroads by the strong arm of the British power, she is defenceless in matters where the English and the Indian interests clash, and where (as a Tamil saying puts it) the very fence begins to feed on the crop. In all vital matters relating to India, England holds the whip-hand and men, sent out to us to watch those interests on the spot, are placed directly under that whip-hand. It requires preternatural strength of conviction and fortitude to withstand the flourish of the lash wielded by that whip-hand when the English and Indian interests stand mutually opposed. I am painfully conscious that I have spoken with considerable warmth, but I could not carry a smile on my lips or play the role of a soft-tongued courtier when I am face to face with a gross injury, which is in store for the masses." Not only do these representatives of the Native provinces speak, but the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir Alexander M'Kenzie, also strongly protested. Sir A. M'Kenzie said that: "Sir James Westland has not dealt with what to my mind is one of the principal objections to the measure, that is the protection and favouritism shown to one special item of our import tariff while there are undoubtedly many other items in that tariff which have equal claims to consideration. As a Free Trader myself, I shall rejoice to see the day when we revert to Free Trade altogether, but as long as our finances require us to realise duties of this kind I can see no particular reason why cotton should be more favoured than woollen or other goods in the tariff." These were the remarks of an able and trusted servant of the Crown, and he referred to them particularly because during his visits to India he had seen that other industries there, in consequence of the cheapness of labour and their having the raw material at their doors, were seriously affecting some of our home industries. There was the paper-making industry. The time was when almost every pound of paper used in India was exported from this country. Now there are several large and flourishing paper mills in India which had obtained almost the whole of the Government contracts, and were supplying the commercial classes with the whole of their paper. The consequences of this was that there had been a very large and serious reduction in the exports of paper from this country to India, and that was one of the causes why the paper industry in this country was now seriously depressed. Then there was another industry with which he was personally acquainted. It was that in which his own constituents were directly engaged. It had been for a number of years a very large and prosperous industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member must confine himself to the question of the Cotton Duties.

SIR JOHN LENG bowed at once to the ruling of the Speaker. He went on to say that it might not be out of order for him to allude to a question which he put some time ago to the Secretary for India, and in which he referred to one serious inequality in the competition between English and Indian industries. It was an industry where they were allowed in India by the Factory Act to work Saturday and Sunday, night and day, all the year round. He appealed to the Secretary for India to use his influence in order that something like the Saturday and Sunday bank holidays which we had in this country might be established in that Indian industry; but the noble Lord relied simply on the legality of the Act, and gave no promise that he would interfere in the matter. The only other brief extract he would take from the Blue-book was a telegram which summed up very much the whole of the case. It was a telegram from the Hon. P. M. Mehta, President of the Bombay Presidency Association, to the Secretary of the Government of India, and was as follows: "I am instructed by the Council of the Bombay Presidency Association to telegraph to you the

following resolution passed to-day: 'That the pending proposal with regard to Cotton Duties before the Council is calculated to cause serious discontent among people, inasmuch as, coming on top of various recent measures, it leads people to firm conviction that their interests are being constantly sacrificed to those of a section of the British community; that it is a measure of grave political and economic impolicy to put an excise on coarse cloths worn by the poorest classes, especially when it is done after remitting a portion of duty paid by the richer classes on finer cloths, and that avowedly for no existing substantial reason, but, as admitted by the Finance Minister, solely for the purpose of enabling Lancashire to make experiment; that intense and real excitement and indignation prevail among all classes of people at proposed legislation; and the Council venture to urge that such policy cannot fail to be extremely detrimental to the best interests of the Empire.'" Large public meetings, with thousands attending them, had been held in all the great centres of population in India to protest against this alteration of the Cotton Duties. He felt interested in this question, because he was satisfied that the Lancashire agitation was based on a delusion, and was promoted by the cry that a great reduction of exports to India took place in the earlier months of 1895. Five months were a very limited period in the course of trade, and prominence was not given to the fact that in the year 1894 great speculation, great over-trading, and an excessive export of those cotton goods took place. The excess of exports to India in 1894 over the average of preceding years was not less than 357,000,000 yards, and in the first nine months of 1895 the reduction only amounted to 134,000,000, leaving an excess of 233,000,000 yards. He would like to bring another very striking fact before the House with regard to alleged Indian competition. Besides what the Bombay manufacturers sold for their own home market in India, they exported in 1893-4 about 54,000,000 yards of piece goods. That seemed a pretty large quantity, but there was imported from this country in the same period no less than 2,366,000,000 yards, chiefly from Lancashire. So that the Indian exports, which it was contended were to damage and ruin the Lancashire trade, amounted to only one-fortieth of what they imported from Lancashire. He would detain the House no further than to read a communication which he had received that morning from a gentleman who had spent more than a quarter of a century in India, and who was very intimately acquainted with both its financial and commercial interests. That gentleman wrote: "It is very unfortunate that the British Parliament has ever felt called upon to dictate to the Government of India the way in which its revenue shall or shall not be raised. The people of India who pay the taxes have the first claim to decide how the taxes shall be levied, and what those taxes shall be. The British Parliament has been until very recently regarded by the people of India as their last resort in search of equity and justice. It has been looked up to as the palladium of their rights. Magistrates might go wrong—men are but human—those charged with the government of the country might be led astray—such things do occur, and it was felt that the pulse of the British Parliament beat strong to help the oppressed, to do justice in scorn of consequence, and that self-interest and greed for gain might be searched for vainly within its walls." It must be borne in mind that, notwithstanding its many millions, the average income of the people of India is extremely small. Therefore, if a tax is to touch those millions, it must be on articles of daily use by them. There is an extremely heavy tax on salt, and a duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on all cotton piece goods, whether imported into or manufactured in India by power-looms. Government by mandate, which is the name now given to the interference of the Secretary of State, is not calculated to cement the dependencies to the mother country, and it has certainly not tended to increase the loyalty of Her Majesty's Indian subjects, than whom it would be difficult to find a more peaceable, law-abiding, and orderly people.

Mr. Philip Stanhope: Will the hon. member give the name of his correspondent?

Sir John Leng shook his head.

Lord G. Hamilton said he did not question the right of the hon. baronet to make use of the forms of the House to call attention to this matter, but thought it was unfortunate he had done so. It was, in his opinion, one of the most difficult and, perhaps, one of the most dangerous questions that Parliament could be called upon to deal with. The hon. baronet had alluded to the political danger of a collision between the public opinion of this country and of India. So far as he knew, Lancashire had never objected to the Indian Government having complete control over its taxation. What Lancashire contended for was the principle of perfect equality of treatment, and that, if India was to remain a part of the Empire, perfect equality of treatment was what Englishmen had a right to demand. So long as taxation was imposed on that principle, the political danger would disappear; but the moment it was attempted to differentiate between the industry of one country and the other, both were brought into collision. So long as the principle of perfect equality was established there was no fear of any wide difference of opinion between those who live in these islands and those who live in India. His predecessor in office, in giving his assent to the tariff of taxes of 1894, deemed that he had established that perfect equality of treatment, and declared, in most unmistakable terms, that, if it could be shown that these duties were in any way unequal in their application or protective in their character, he was bound to consider any such representation with the view and desire of eliminating from the duties any vestige of protection. (Hear, hear.) That was the attitude the right hon. gentleman took up and he was bound to say that he had endeavoured honourably to fulfil his pledges. (Hear, hear.) The previous duty which was in force was a 5 per cent. customs duty upon all cloth goods and yarns imported into India, but the duty, supposed to be equivalent to the customs duties raised by the Excise, was 5 per cent., not on the finished value of the cloth, but on the initial value of the yarn before it was woven into cloth, and all yarn below 20 counts was exempted from taxation; consequently it was demonstrably clear that all English goods which went to India under 20 counts paid a 5 per cent. duty from which similar goods made in India were exempt. He did not say that the difference was very substantial, but theoretically there was a case of protection. Any-one who looked at the able statement drawn up on behalf of Lancashire would see that the case was unanswerable—namely, that the duties as imposed did not comply with the sole condition which accompanied their imposition. In these circumstances the attention of the Indian Government was called to the fact, and they were asked to reconsider the tariff with a view to bring it into harmony with the Parliamentary condition on which alone it was sanctioned. The hon. gentleman had referred to the hiatus which occurred between his letter of the 5th of September and the telegram of the Indian Government of the 16th of January, and wanted to know what was done in the interval. The Government of India were acting, as far as they could, on the instructions contained in his letter, and were endeavouring to ascertain how they could possibly amend the tariff so as to bring it into conformity with the distinct pledge given to Parliament; and they were forced, after exhausting every conceivable method, to come to the conclusion that the only possible way to maintain these cotton duties in accordance with that pledge was to adopt the system which the hon. baronet now condemned. The hon. member said that he did not ask for very much. The hon. gentleman only asked that a line should be drawn across cotton goods, and that the Government should say that, inasmuch as there was but little competition between England and India in the lower counts, all those counts should be free, and that taxation should be imposed on cloth above a certain standard. The first reason why they should not adopt that course was that it was not in the interests of the poor consumer that they should do so, and the second was that this tariff which they had sent out was, in his judgment, calculated to impose a greater burden upon the poor consumer than the tariff which it succeeded. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that all economical and industrial forces were stationary, and that if they drew a hard-and-fast line and put a tax upon one side, that tax would leave things much as they were before. But all these forces were moving, and if they introduced merely a comparatively slight change they would cause a disturbance out of all proportion to the change. If they drew a hard-and-fast line, as had been proved over and over again, over a great mass of commodities, and said that all above a certain quality should be taxed, that would cause a rise in the price of all commodities to which that taxation applied. But they could not exempt those on the other side of the line from rising in price also. (Hear, hear.) They rose in sympathy. The primary object of these duties was that the Government should obtain as much as possible of the enhanced price, but the whole of the enhanced price of the yarn and cloths below 20's,

which would be paid by the consumer under the proposal of the hon. baronet, would go into the pockets of the producers. (Hear, hear.) The hon. baronet was unconsciously advocating, not the interests of the poor consumer, but of the Bombay producer. Economically his proposal was altogether unsound. As long as there was a duty on yarns, it was possible to distinguish between the qualities of the yarns. Many of his hon. friends had been connected all their lives with the cotton trade, but he did not believe that one of them would say that when yarns were woven into cloth they could as accurately discriminate between what was above and what was below a certain line. The moment they attempted to draw such a line they would land themselves in endless difficulties. If they put a tax upon any particular article, it was essential that they should put a tax upon any substitute for it. The experiment was tried in India in 1878, and it had absolutely broken down. An exemption was made on certain classes of cotton goods, and the result was so extraordinary that he almost hesitated to quote the figures. He, however, had tested their accuracy. Before the slight alteration was made the free goods imported from England amounted to 9,000,000 yards, the amount of duty-paid goods being 358 million yards. In the first six months of the next year the duty-paid goods fell to 323 million yards, and the duty-free goods rose to 99 million yards; while in the subsequent year the duty-paid goods fell to 164 million yards, and the duty-free goods rose to 360 million yards. Sir James Westland, in his statement contained in the Blue-book, said that he had received a letter from one of the import merchants of Calcutta, in which the writer said: "As regards, however, practically the whole of what is technically called 'grey cloth,' of which the bulk of the Lancashire imports consists, they are used by the same class of consumers as take the production of the Indian mills, and if they can, owing to their passing free of duty, obtain the latter on more favourable terms than the former, then unquestionably the tendency will be towards a decrease in the demand for those least favourably situated." Further on Sir James Westland said: "Another document which I only received last night comes from Manchester. It says, after referring to the argument which the Manchester merchants put forward, in which they asserted that the relief of goods under 20's, was sure to react in the form of restricting the demand for goods over 20's. On Tuesday I had a very remarkable confirmation of my opinion in the shape of two pieces manufactured by one of the Petit group of mills at Bombay from 20's yarns, which have totally supplanted an English-made cloth, the yarns being 28's in the twist (the 'reed' threads) and 32's in the weft (the 'pick' threads). The remarkable feature of this case is the wide difference in the yarns and the 'reed' and 'pick' of the substituted and supplanted cloths. That 20's should be substituted for 22's or 24's and 12 or 13 threads per quarter inch for 14 or 15 we were quite prepared for, but that substitution should have at once gone so far we did not expect." These are two pieces of further evidence received since the Bill was introduced, and confirm the view the Government of India has taken in this matter, and on which it has based its policy, that there is no permanent solution of the difficulty in any system which will leave a dividing line at any point, and tax the cloth which is above that line, and exempt from the tax the cloth which is below it. The moment differential treatment was attempted difficulties arose. The one thing which trade was afraid of, and which paralysed it, was a fear of legislation which would alter existing terms of competition. So long as taxation was to be on perfectly equitable terms, whether the tax was raised or whether it was lowered did not very much matter to the competitors, because both could compete on perfectly equal terms. But the moment they differentiated by legislation the result was to bring the two competing industries directly into conflict with each other. That had been one of the troubles in the past, and, warned by the past, the Government had, after looking into this question from the Imperial and broadest point of view, felt that they must not have recourse to legislation which would bring two great industrial communities, not only into trade competition, but into political competition with one another. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. baronet said that he brought forward this motion in the interests of the poor, but, if they looked for the source of such proposals, they could often be traced to the Bombay millowners. He, for one, had not the least objection to the case of the Bombay millowners, or any other millowners, being properly represented before that House, and they were entitled to perfect justice and equality of treatment; but it should not be said that their case was put forward in the interests of commerce. Had the hon. baronet ever attempted to find out what proportions of cloth the power looms in India supplied to the population? If not he would be surprised to hear how small the proportion was. He had some figures showing the proportions of yarn consumed by the power looms and by the hand looms, which he would lay before the House. The power looms, it was estimated, consumed 78 million pounds of yarn, and the hand looms consumed 311 million pounds of yarn. It was further estimated that the imports from Lancashire amounted to no less than 308 million pounds of yarn; and, therefore, out of upwards of 650 million pounds of yarn woven into cloth, the power looms of India only absorbed 78 millions, or, in other words, they scarcely supplied 10 per cent. of the cloth which was consumed in India. It was quite a mistake to assume, as the hon. baronet did, that the coarser cloths were worn by the poor, who, whether for reasons of cost or of greater durability, bought the cloths imported from England. The tariff which had been introduced reduced the burden of taxation upon the consumer, the tax upon imported goods having been reduced by 3½ per cent. He had not a reliable statement of what proportion of imported cloth was consumed by the poor of India, but he was perfectly certain that more than half of it was bought by them. The enormous mass of yarn utilised by hand looms was free from taxation, and consequently the products were cheaper than they had been. (Hear, hear.) He thought he had shown that the proposal of the hon. baronet was one to which the House could not assent. He owned that he felt great satisfaction at having been able to bring about an arrangement that put an end to the agitation which previously existed, and he believed that arrangement was a perfectly fair one. The hon. gentleman who spoke second told them that a great many people in India objected to it, but he did not tell them what their arguments were. It was the misfortune of these trade disputes that the natural sympathies of those residing in the localities where the industries were situated were always in favour of that industry. It was a matter of sentiment rather than of argument, and that had in the past constituted the main danger of this question. So far as he knew this agitation had absolutely quieted down. It was seen now that they had made a just and fair settlement, and the proposal of the hon. baronet, though a small one in itself, would in reality knock away the keystone of the system which had superseded that which was previously in force. For these reasons he hoped that the House would not only reject the proposal which the hon. baronet had made but, inasmuch as he had brought forward no arguments in support of it, that they would not consider it necessary to continue the debate at any length. In supporting the Government the House would endorse the view that they had contrived to bring about an equitable and judicial solution of as contentious a matter as could be brought before any Government. (Cheers.)

Sir H. FOWLER said the three speeches which had been delivered had severally illustrated the extreme inconvenience of the mode in which this question had been brought before the House. There had been no notice upon the paper, and there had been no intimation except a rumour in the Press that possibly this question might be forwarded within forty-eight hours.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said that he had sent an intimation to the leader of the Opposition.

Sir H. FOWLER said the right hon. gentleman only received that intimation that morning, and he did not conceive that to be an intimation to the House, which was entitled to have full notice. This question, the gravity of which it was impossible to exaggerate, had been brought before them in a manner which he thought prejudiced it, and which would tend to produce an unfortunate effect in India. He should be prepared, at the proper time and under proper circumstances, to defend his own action and also to criticise what had been done since he held office; but hon. members had not had this Blue-book in their hands many hours, and for his own part he candidly confessed that he had not had time to carefully read it. He knew nothing of the correspondence which had passed between the noble lord opposite and the Government of India; he was only aware that certain proposals had been adopted which really carried out in their main character his own original proposal. The old controversy had been raised between Lancashire and India, and

the question as to the limit of the amount of the excise duty which had been levied by the Government had also been raised. He wished to point out to the House that these were grave questions which ought to be discussed in a regular manner, so that the House could arrive at a decision which would carry some weight with it. They were asked to vote upon the question "That this House do now adjourn," but could anybody undertake to explain to the people of India what that meant? Practically it was a vote of censure upon the Government for the action they had taken, and which had received the approval of the Legislative Council of India. It was suggested that the noble lord should withhold his assent from this Bill, which, no doubt, originally emanated to a great extent from himself, or had his full approval. He had no doubt the noble lord had followed what Lord Salisbury laid down in his celebrated despatch as to the relative positions of the Legislative Council and the Secretary of State, and the great mischief which would accrue to the public interests, and especially to commercial interests, if there was any collision between those two powers. No doubt the Legislative Council fully understood what the noble lord was going to do. They could not suppose that the noble lord was going to upset the work of his own hands, or that the Legislative Council was going to repeal what it has just passed. If the noble lord were to adopt the suggestion that he should arbitrarily annul what he had presumably assented to only within the last three months, that would be a course deserving of the censure of the House, and would be without precedent and incapable of defence. (Hear, hear.) He deprecated this premature, immature, and inconclusive debate. He was, he believed, as strong a party fighting man as any man on that side of the House, but he never would consent to throw India into the vortex of our party politics. At this moment, when they had a fight with the Government on a question in regard to which strong party feeling was aroused, and when they were on the eve of another party political fight of perhaps greater magnitude, there was no pressing necessity to throw this question into the cauldron of political strife, and if it were done it would, he believed, produce a very unfortunate effect. He hoped his hon. friend would not go to a division, but if he did the result would be that the House, without any opportunity of fairly and fully discussing the papers, would commit itself to an approval of the action of the Secretary of State. The hon. baronet said that the action of the noble lord was very much disapproved in India; he knew nothing at all about that, but if that were so how important it was that their decision upon this question should not be arrived at in a hurry. The discussion of this question ought not to have a party aspect. He should decline to defend his own action or censure that of the party opposite. He hoped they should not have a revival of the controversy between Manchester and India until they had an opportunity first of seeing and reading what Lancashire wants, and what was the reply of the Chambers of Commerce and especially of India as to the case put forward by Manchester. Lancashire members had a right to be heard. Reference had been made to the admirable speech of the Finance Minister of India, and by chance he had come upon this passage:—"I have heard it argued, and it has been argued to-day, that they are in some respects precisely the classes who ought to contribute to present necessities; inasmuch as the same fall in the rupee which has rendered it necessary for us to enlarge our revenue has been to them a source of advantage. To them it means higher prices for their agricultural produce, and more active trade in carrying it away to the markets. Those who argue about oppressiveness of taxation and the inability of these classes to meet the demand, altogether forget, it seems to me, the figures with which they are dealing. The whole tax which we intend to obtain by Cotton Duties is put down at 105 lakhs of rupees; the number of people who pay it—for nearly every soul in India wears cotton cloths—is something like 287 millions; and the result of these two figures is to show that the average contribution of each person in the tax is about seven pies, a little over half an anna. It is a tax which by the nature of its application is to some extent graduated according to the means of the payer, and we may safely say that the vast mass of the population to which I have referred will not be called on to pay on the average more than half an anna, and that the poorest classes—those who cannot afford to indulge in even such minor luxuries as a good *dhuti*—will not have to pay, even if they used taxed cloth, more than a quarter as much, or, say, one pie and a half. To talk of this as oppressive taxation is a misuse of words." (Hear, hear.) He was sorry to have interposed in that debate, but he thought it due to the House to make these few remarks. (Hear, hear.) The changes made by the noble lord were of great gravity and they could not be properly discussed on a motion for the adjournment. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. George Whiteley agreed as to the great inconvenience that must ensue if this subject was to be sprung upon the House in this manner. The Motion appeared to be based upon the argument that the consequence of the alteration of the duties would be an increase of taxation upon the poor of India. He should like to know at what percentage the hon. baronet fixed the poor of India? He did not think he should be over-stating the facts if he were to put it at 80 per cent. or 90 per cent., and yet the noble lord had pointed out that the amount of duty-free goods consumed in India previous to the alteration of the duties was only one-tenth of the total consumption. Unless the hon. Baronet was prepared to argue that the poor classes of India were not more than one-tenth of the whole population, the superstructure he had raised was entirely dissipated. (Hear, hear.) At present all the people of India were called upon to pay was $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. additional taxation upon one-tenth of their consumption, whereas they were relieved to the extent of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon nine-tenths of their consumption. The position of Lancashire was clear. They had pointed to the increasing and fierce competition taking place between India and Lancashire. They had showed that, whilst they in Lancashire had a retrogressive and stagnant trade, in India there was a developing and progressive trade. They had stated that, while in Lancashire millions of spindles were stopped, in India the cotton factories were paying dividends of from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent., and that during the year subsequent to the imposition of these duties the shares of the Bombay mills increased in value to the extent of 1,600,000 tens of rupees. Taking those facts into consideration, it could not be argued that India was suffering. It had been contended and proved that the duties were protective. Up to 20's counts they were absolutely protective. The hon. member gave an example of the way in which an inferior article made in India was made to pass as of Lancashire manufacture, but said he would not enlarge upon this matter, as it would be brought out if a debate rose upon the question. They had got what they claimed and asked for. They had asked that their position should be rendered identical with that of the Indian manufacturer, and that there should be an equalisation of duties. In granting them that, he thought the noble lord had removed the bone of contention between Lancashire and India—(hear, hear)—and they now joined hands with the Indian manufacturers in an attempt to get the whole of the duties abolished. The imposition of the duties in India had been referred to as costly and vexatious. It had also been said that this was protection in favour of the hand-loom manufacturer against the power-loom manufacturer. A duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was protective, in the mind of the hon. baronet, when it came between the power-loom manufacturer and the hand-loom manufacturer, but, according to his contention, and that of many hon. members on the same side of the House, a 5 per cent. duty was not protective when it was imposed upon Lancashire goods against Indian goods. (Hear, hear.) Agitation and excitement had, no doubt, taken place in India, but he believed, from representations he had had, that they had died down. They also took place in Lancashire when the people felt they were being treated in a distinctly unfair manner. (Hear, hear.) He believed the present arrangement was one agreeable to the manufacturers of both Lancashire and India. Whether the duties rose or fell was a matter of no importance to Lancashire manufacturers so long as they were not placed at a disadvantage in competition with Indian manufacturers in the Indian markets, and they all paid alike. (Cheers.)

Mr. Stanhope suggested to the hon. baronet the propriety of withdrawing his motion, as he considered that the time of introducing it was not judiciously selected. He agreed with the hon. member for Stockport as to the reasonable measure of contentment resulting from the action of the Government in altering the duties, but he still hoped to see them entirely removed, as altogether undesirable. That question had best be discussed, however, when the financial affairs of India were debated, and he hoped that that time would be early. The hon. baronet, the member for Dundee, a little exercised in his mind by what had taken place in the House last summer, took a trip to Bombay last winter, dined with a number of

gentlemen connected with the trade of Bombay, and came back impressed with the notion that the Lancashire people were most selfish. On that point he must have some better evidence than that supplied by the hon. baronet.

Mr. BALFOUR moved that the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: Surely it will not be necessary to put such a motion after the speeches which have been made on both sides of the House.

Mr. LOUGH thought his hon. friend would act wisely if he withdrew his motion, but he hoped the leader of the House would give them a promise that the Indian Budget should be brought on at a time when this subject could be adequately discussed.

Mr. BALFOUR said that no one was more anxious than he that the Indian Budget should come on at a time when Indian matters could be adequately discussed, but he was not the obstacle to the progress of business. He felt that this was not a time when this subject could be properly discussed, and therefore he hoped the House would dispose of the motion without a division. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN understood the right hon. gentleman would do his utmost to bring on the Indian Budget on an early day, and therefore asked leave to withdraw his motion.

The motion was then, by leave, withdrawn.

May 19th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer by whom the extraordinary expenses of the Indian contingent at Suakin were to be borne.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I stated the other day in reply to the right hon. gentleman the member for West Monmouthshire that these expenses would be a matter of arrangement between the Egyptian Government and Her Majesty's Government, and I have nothing as yet to add to that statement.

Subsequently,

Sir C. DILKE asked whether it was intended to take the motion on as to the employment of the Indian troops before the question was settled as to which country would pay the ordinary charge.

Mr. BALFOUR said that it was not necessary to settle which country would bear the charge before the House came to a conclusion in regard to the employment of the troops.

Mr. J. MORLEY said that the resolution which was put on the paper last night by the Secretary for India differed in form from that adopted in 1885, inasmuch as the words "unless funds otherwise provided" had been introduced. They could not discuss that question very well until they understood what other provision besides that made by Parliament was left open.

Mr. BALFOUR: The right hon. gentleman will please bear in mind that the object of the resolution and the protection it gives is to prevent Indian funds being touched for this purpose and that object is satisfactorily accomplished by the resolution, and the question of who has to bear the particular charge will not be affected by the discussion of the resolution.

Sir C. DILKE: Is it not the case that the question of the Indian funds is at issue.

Mr. BALFOUR: Yes, the Indian funds.

Sir C. DILKE: The question whether Egypt or India is to pay the ordinary charge being left open, the matter cannot be concluded by the debate.

Mr. BALFOUR: That is not left open. What is left open is whether Egypt or England is to pay.

May 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STAFF-CORPS OFFICERS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would consider the advisability of extending temporary promotion to the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major, which had recently been accorded to staff corps officers serving as commandants and seconds in command of Native regiments, to staff corps officers serving in the military departments under the Government of India, with a view to placing them on an equal footing as regards temporary promotion with their comrades in regimental employment.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The position of officers serving in the military department under the Government of India is not analogous to that of the commandants and seconds in command of Native regiments, and I do not consider it necessary to extend to them the temporary promotion to the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major recently granted to the latter class of officers.

OFFICERS ON THE GENERAL LIST.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that the Government had taken all the time of the House on Tuesday, 12th May, for which day a motion in regard to the grievances of the officers of the general list had the first place, he would consent to the appointment of a small select committee to enquire into the injustice of which these officers complain.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I understand my hon. friend's question to relate only to the officers now on the general list, but in my opinion it would be quite impossible to confine any enquiry to these officers alone. It must necessarily be extended to all those who have already retired, accepting as final the repeated decisions of the Secretary of State on this subject. Every officer's case would have to be reconsidered. The case of the officers of the general list was discussed in this House in 1888, and has been repeatedly considered by successive Secretaries of State, who have always held that these officers had no claim whatever to the concession granted in 1866 to the staff corps and to officers who formerly belonged to the East India Company's army. Concurring as I do in this view, I am afraid that I cannot consent to the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the case.

THE UNCOVENANTED SERVICES.

Mr. BARNES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had sanctioned the orders contained in the resolution of the Government of India, dated 22nd June, 1895, under which in future only half the service of certain Indian uncovenanted officers before a certain date (11th December, 1893) would be allowed to count towards furlough, though formerly all such service was counted:

Whether he was aware that the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and subsequent authoritative statements, had encouraged these officers to expect concessions instead of restrictions in regard to their furlough rules:

And whether the correspondence on the subject of the grievances of the Indian Uncovenanted Civil Services would be laid upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The orders to which the hon. member refers did not require the sanction of the Secretary of State, but were reported for information. Having regard to the circumstances, I see no reason for disapproving them. The new rules must be regarded as a whole, and no officer need come under these unless he chooses to do so. The correspondence is voluminous and not quite complete; but I shall offer no objection to a motion for a Return in continuation of No. 168 of 1892 as soon as the despatch now under consideration shall have reached the Government of India.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. BALFOUR, in making a statement of the intentions of the Government for the business of the House after the Whitsuntide recess, said that it was proposed to take the resolution with regard to the Indian troops for the Sudan on Thursday, June 4th.